

551132

Carol Hanlon  
S&ER Products Manager  
U. S. Department of Energy  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office  
P.O. Box 30307 M/S 025  
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0707  
Fax number: 1-800-967-0739

RECEIVED

OCT 3 - 2001

Dear Ms. Hanlon:

The following list of facts seems to pretty clearly present the case for recommending the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site for high-level waste disposal.

- For about two decades, there have been in-depth scientific studies of Yucca Mountain. The studies have covered hydrology, geology, seismology and more.
- Throughout these studies, teams of scientists have found no evidence that would disqualify Yucca Mountain as a site for a permanent repository for high level radioactive waste.
- Regulatory, advisory and scientific peer groups have continually reviewed this research.
- Earlier reports, such as those from the National Academy of Sciences and the DOE's draft environmental impact statement, have presented a strong case for the development of a repository as the safest and most economical way to dispose of used fuel rods from commercial nuclear power plants and radioactive waste from government use.
- Storing high level radioactive waste at one location is a better option than continuing to accumulate used fuel at more than 70 sites around the country.
- The proposed repository would have specially engineered containers for holding high level radioactive waste materials and a robust combination of engineered and natural barriers to protect the environment.
- The transportation casks for fuel rods, designed and built to withstand rigors, have been put through exhaustive testing, withstanding even the destructive forces of a speeding locomotive. Since the mid-1960s, an outstanding safety record has been compiled with about 3,000 shipments of used fuel.
- While scientists and government leaders investigate recycling of used fuel and other advanced methods for treating radioactive waste, it is clear that there will still be a need for a repository for the radioactive byproducts of these processes.
- Legislation enacted in 1982 provided that in exchange for payments into the Nuclear Waste Fund by electricity consumers, the Department of Energy would begin taking spent fuel from utilities by January 31, 1998. That date came and went. Although three federal courts have reaffirmed that DOE has a legal obligation to accept spent fuel, it has accepted none. And, this is despite the fact that consumers of electricity generated by nuclear energy have committed \$16 billion to the Nuclear Waste Fund to pay for the repository.

I encourage the Department of Energy to take action based on the science and to leave the politics out of the equation. The science clearly supports the suitability of Yucca Mountain for waste disposal.

Sincerely,



Michael C. Baker, Ph.D., P.E.  
2440 Canyon Glen  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

1